

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|--------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/647,403 | CAI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Christina Johnson | 1725 | |

All Participants:

(1) Christina Johnson.

(2) George Grove.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 1 June 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

2, 5, 7

Prior art documents discussed:


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SRE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 2, 5, and 7 were amended, placing the application in condition for allowance. The amendments were proposed to place claims 2, 5, and 7 in proper Markush form as set forth in the MPEP. Applicant's representative agreed to the change to be made by examiner's amendment. A copy of the agreed upon change can be found in the attached examiner's amendment..